OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:

Peer Review

Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jjnpp-163301
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 20(4) ; e163301

Peer Review Report for "Anti-wrinkle and Antioxidant Activity of the Formulated Collagen-Based Cream from *Holothuria leucospilota*"

Author(s): Goodarz Hashemi, Azar Mostoufi, Eskandar Moghimipour, Hossein Hassanpour, Sadegh Shirian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	7 Jun 2025
Revised Date:	5 Oct 2025
Accepted Date:	6 Oct 2025

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE : Reviewer

9 Jun 2025

1-The manuscript should be revised regarding writing and grammar.
2-table titles should be inserted above the tables.
3- table 5: some SOD values are not in accordance of what is stated in the text. e.g. there is stated in the text that there is no difference in week one among all groups but the numbers in the tables show differences.
4-why T-AOC decreased in 4th week of group 2.5%?
5- suggest to discuss about statistical analysis of the results more precisely

Esmaeil Mohammadian : Reviewer

9 Jun 2025

Dear Editor
Have a nice day.
The author investigated Anti-wrinkle and antioxidant activity of the formulated collagen based cream from Holothuria leucospilota.
I would suggest reconsidering the manuscript for publication only after the following major revision.
1. The conclusion part should be more complete.
2. The source of all materials used must be cited.
3. The article does not have an abstract.
4. Provide a structure for Figure 6.
5. Some sentences are poorly written and require revision to make them more fluent.

REFEREE : Associate Editor 24 Jun 2025

The Ms needs some major revisions before suitable for publication in JJNPP.

REFEREE : EIC 24 Jun 2025

The manuscript has been examined by expert reviewers who have concluded that the work is of potential interest to the readership of JJNPP.
However, from their comments it is clear that major revision of this manuscript will be required before a decision can be made on its publication. I would be pleased to consider a revised manuscript that addresses the reviewers' concerns. Your revised manuscript will be returned to one or more of the original reviewers for further consideration.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Reviewer 1:
1-The manuscript should be revised regarding writing and grammar.

Grammar and writing of the article were corrected.
2-table titles should be inserted above the tables.

The titles were written above the table.
3- table 5: some SOD values are not in accordance of what is stated in the text. e.g. there is stated in the text that there is no difference in week one among all groups but the numbers in the tables show differences.

It was corrected.

The collage cream 2.5% showed significantly lower SOD activity than those of other treatment groups ($p<0.01$).

4-why T-AOC decreased in 4th week of group 2.5%?

It was corrected.

There was no significant difference between all groups in terms of T-AOC at all period times.

5- suggest to discuss about statistical analysis of the results more precisely

The results were corrected

Reviewer 2:.
1. The conclusion part should be more complete.

The conclusion was stated more completely.

2. The source of all materials used must be cited.

The sources was stated.

3. The article does not have an abstract.

Abstract was added.

4. Provide a structure for Figure 6.

The structure was provided.

5. Some sentences are poorly written and require revision to make them more fluent.

Grammar and writing of the article were corrected.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Esmaeil Mohammadian : Reviewer — 5 Aug 2025

Dear Editor
Have a nice day.
The author investigated “Anti-wrinkle and antioxidant activity of the formulated collagen based cream from Holothuria leucospilota ”.
In my opinion, this manuscript cannot be considered for publication. The main reasons for this outcome are as follows:
1. The manuscript is not well written in all parts.
2. Answers to comments are not done correctly.

REFEREE : Reviewer — 12 Aug 2025

In Table 7, it is important to ensure consistent and appropriate significant figures in the reported values. For example, a value such as "13 ± 2.08" should be revised to "13.00 ± 2.08" to maintain consistency in decimal places between the mean and the uncertainty. Reporting the mean as a whole number (13) while associating it with an uncertainty given to two decimal places (2.08) creates a mismatch in precision. To reflect the implied precision of the uncertainty, the mean should also be expressed to two decimal places.

Similarly, in Table 4, the value "57 ± 0.02" is problematic because the uncertainty is reported to the hundredths place, while the mean is given as a whole number. This suggests a false level of precision. If the measurement uncertainty is ±0.02, then the mean should be reported with two decimal places (e.g., 57.00 ± 0.02) to accurately represent the precision of the measurement.

Consistent use of significant figures and decimal places enhances clarity and scientific rigor, ensuring that readers correctly interpret the precision of the data. Therefore, all values in the tables should be reviewed and adjusted so that the number of decimal places in the mean matches those in the associated uncertainty.
The Ms Needs to improver English writting:

1. Line 5: “the structure of dermis with increasing of age was reducing in the density”
This sentence is grammatically incorrect and awkward. The phrase “with increasing of age” is not natural English; it should be “with increasing age” or “as age increases.” Also, “was reducing” is unnecessarily passive and imprecise. A better phrasing uses present tense for general scientific facts.
Improved version: In adults, dermal density decreases with age.

2. Line 5–6: “and the production of collagen gradually decrease with age”
Subject-verb agreement error: “production” is singular, so the verb should be “decreases,” not “decrease.”
Improved version: and collagen production gradually decreases with age.

3. Line 6: “for prevention from skin ageing”
Incorrect preposition. We say “prevention of,” not “prevention from.” Also, “skin ageing” is British spelling; if writing for an international journal, “aging” (American English) is often preferred, though both are acceptable if consistent.
Improved version: to prevent skin aging

4. Line 7: “by use of collagen based cream”
Awkward and ungrammatical. “By use of” is not idiomatic; better to say “using” or “through the use of.” Also, “collagen based” needs a hyphen.
Improved version: using a collagen-based cream

5. Line 8: “the effects of collagen extracted from sea cucumber of Holothuria leucospilota on the histological appearance and ROS levels of aged mice skin investigated for the first time”
This is a sentence fragment—it lacks a main verb. “Investigated” is a past participle, not a finite verb. It needs a subject and auxiliary verb. Also, “sea cucumber of Holothuria leucospilota” is redundant and awkward. The species name already indicates the sea cucumber.
Improved version: this study investigates, for the first time, the effects of collagen extracted from the sea cucumber Holothuria leucospilota on the histological features and reactive oxygen species (ROS) levels in aged mouse skin.

6. Line 9: “The collagen was firstly extracted from H.leucospilota.”
“Firstly” is not commonly used in scientific writing; “first” is preferred. Also, there should be a space after “H.” and the species name should be italicized.
Improved version: Collagen was first extracted from H. leucospilota.

7. Line 10–11: “Four various formulations were evaluated based on their appearance, pH determination, homogeneity, Spreadability and the best formula was chosen as use baseline formula.”
“Four various” is redundant—“four” already implies variety. “Spreadability” should not be capitalized. “as use baseline formula” is incorrect; likely meant “as the baseline formula.”
Improved version: Four formulations were evaluated based on appearance, pH, homogeneity, and spreadability, and the best one was selected as the baseline formula.

8. Line 12: “72 healthy female NMRI mice from breeding colony were randomly divided into six groups (each of 12).”
Missing article: “from breeding colony” should be “from a breeding colony.” Also, “each of 12” is awkward. Better to use standard scientific notation.

Improved version: Seventy-two healthy female NMRI mice from a breeding colony were randomly divided into six groups (n = 12 per group).

REFEREE : Associate Editor

12 Aug 2025

The Ms still needs some major revisions before sultable for publication in JJNPP.

REFEREE : EIC

12 Aug 2025

Our impression is that the above-mentioned manuscript could become suitable for publication in JJNPP. However, the criticism from the referees requires that we defer a final decision until you have considered their remarks and revised your manuscript accordingly.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

1. *The manuscript is not well written in all parts.*
   - Grammar and writing in all parts of the article were corrected by a language tool.

2. *Answers to comments:*
   - The values in all the tables were corrected

   - *why T-AOC decreased in 4th week of group 2.5%?*

This decrease was obtained by experimental methods; however, there was no significant difference between all groups in terms of T-AOC at all period times, and collagen-based cream 2.5% had the better mean percentage of collagen content in aged mice skin in various groups and lower SOD activity. In comparison of different creams, the collagen-based cream 2.5% has been selected.

   - *suggest to discuss about statistical analysis of the results more precisely*

Results are reported as means ± standard error of mean (SEM). By SPSS version,[22] the data were analyzed, and the differences between means of the individual groups were analyzed using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by Tukey's HSD test. Differences were considered statistically significant at $p<0.05$. The mean percentage of collagen content at the first to fourth weeks post-treatment in each group was analyzed using repeated-measure ANOVA. All statistical results are explained in the related section of the article.(Highlighted in the text of the article)

   - *The article does not have an abstract.*

Abstract was added.

   - *- Provide a structure for Figure 6.*

The structure was provided.

- *table 5: some SOD values are not in accordance of what is stated in the text. e.g. there is stated in the text that there is no difference in week one among all groups but the numbers in the tables show differences.*

It was corrected.

The collage cream 2.5% showed significantly lower SOD activity than those of other treatment groups ($p<0.01$).

- *table titles should be inserted above the tables.*

The titles were written above the table.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

REFEREE : Reviewer

4 Sep 2025

The study titled "Anti-wrinkle and antioxidant activity of the formulated collagen-based cream from Holothuria leucospilota" has been evaluated. While the authors have addressed some of the previous reviewers' comments, further revisions are still required to fully meet the journal's standards.
Comments:
1) The manuscript requires proofreading to correct typographical errors, including missing spaces (e.g., "Holothurialeucospilota" → "Holothuria leucospilota") and inconsistent spacing (e.g., "solution was" → "solution was"). Addressing these issues will enhance readability.

2) In Table 3, there is a significant inconsistency in decimal notation between the main viscosity values and their corresponding standard deviations. Specifically:
The viscosity values (e.g., 463, 301, 216) are reported as integers without decimal places. However, the standard deviations (e.g., ± 0.02, ± 0.05) are reported with two decimal places. This discrepancy creates confusion regarding the precision of the data. To resolve this, please ensure consistent decimal formatting for all numerical entries.

Overall, the manuscript requires minor revisions before it can be accepted for publication.

REFEREE : Associate Editor

7 Sep 2025

The Ms still needs some minor revisions before suitable for publication in JJNPP.

REFEREE : EIC

7 Sep 2025

Our impression is that the above-mentioned manuscript could become suitable for publication in JJNPP. However, the criticism from the referees requires that we defer a final decision until you have considered their remarks and revised your manuscript accordingly

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Reviewer 1:
The study titled "Anti-wrinkle and antioxidant activity of the formulated collagen-based cream from Holothuria leucospilota" has been evaluated. While the authors have addressed some of the previous reviewers' comments, further revisions are still required to fully meet the journal's standards.
Comments:
1) The manuscript requires proofreading to correct typographical errors, including missing spaces (e.g., "Holothurialeucospilota" → "Holothuria leucospilota") and inconsistent spacing (e.g., "solution was" → "solution was"). Addressing these issues will enhance readability.

-Grammar and writing in all parts of the article were corrected

2) In Table 3, there is a significant inconsistency in decimal notation between the main viscosity values and their corresponding standard deviations. Specifically:
The viscosity values (e.g., 463, 301, 216) are reported as integers without decimal places. However, the standard deviations (e.g., ± 0.02, ± 0.05) are reported with two decimal places. This discrepancy creates confusion regarding the precision of the data. To resolve this, please ensure consistent decimal formatting for all numerical entries.

- The values in the table 3 were corrected.
-

Overall, the manuscript requires minor revisions before it can be accepted for publication.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

REFEREE : EIC

6 Oct 2025

I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in JJNPP.

Your work underwent a rigorous peer-review process, and the reviewers and editorial board were impressed by the originality, scientific rigor, and relevance of your findings. We believe your contribution will be of significant interest to our readership and will advance the field of natural pharmaceutical products.

Before publication, our production team will contact you regarding final formatting, proofs, and any necessary administrative steps. Please ensure that all authors have approved the final version of the manuscript and that any required ethical or copyright documentation is in order.

On behalf of the editorial board, I congratulate you and your co-authors on this excellent work and thank you for choosing to publish in JJNPP.